

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Julia Rossi,

Plaintiff,

v.

Performant Recovery, Inc.; and DOES 1-10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

:
:
: Civil Action No.: _____
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Julia Rossi, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendant and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Julia Rossi ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Newville, Pennsylvania, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant Performant Recovery, Inc. ("PRI"), is a California business entity with an address of 333 North Canyons Parkway, Suite 100, Livermore, California 94551, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by PRI and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. PRI at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. A person other than the Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to an original creditor (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to PRI for collection, or PRI was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. PRI Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. On or about April 26, 2013, PRI began contacting Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt by placing calls to Plaintiff’s residential telephone.

13. In its calls, PRI stated it was looking to collect a Debt belonging to Eric Rollisin (the “Debtor”).

14. On April 26, 2013, Plaintiff informed PRI that she was not the Debtor, the Debtor did not live at her residence and could not be reached at her number as she had owned the number for over a year.

15. During this conversation, Plaintiff also demanded that PRI cease any future calls to her residential line in its efforts to collect the Debt.

16. Despite being aware it was calling the wrong number, PRI continued to hound Plaintiff with telephone calls.

17. When Plaintiff attempted to inform PRI that it was calling the wrong number during a conversation on or about April 30, 2013, PRI brusquely replied that it would continue to call her number as it was the contact number it had on file for the Debtor and terminated the call.

18. As PRI's calls continued, Plaintiff was forced to call PRI on several occasions to repeat her request that it cease calling her number looking for the Debtor.

19. During a conversation on or about May 1, 2013, Kristen Jones, a representative from PRI, accused Plaintiff of harassment for calling PRI to advise them that they had the wrong number to reach the Debtor.

20. On or about May 2, 2013, Kristen Jones rudely told Plaintiff she was "done listening to hysterics" and that Plaintiff would have "problems" if she continued to call PRI.

21. Later that same day, when Plaintiff informed PRI she would seek legal action for the harassing telephone calls, a representative from PRI replied "tell it to a judge," and terminated the call.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

22. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

23. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

24. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used abusive language when speaking with the consumer.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

29. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

30. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II

**VIOLATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA FAIR CREDIT EXTENSION
UNIFORMITY ACT, 73 P.S. § 2270, et seq.**

31. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

32. The Plaintiff is a "consumer," as defined in 73 P.S. § 2270.3.

33. The Defendants are each individually a “debt collector” as defined in 73 P.S. § 2270.3.

34. The Defendants violated provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., which constitutes an unfair or deceptive practice under 73 P.S. § 2270.4(a).

35. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants’ violations.

COUNT III

INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

36. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

37. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, “One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.”

38. Pennsylvania further recognizes the Plaintiff’s right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus the Defendants violated Pennsylvania state law.

39. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff’s right to privacy by continually harassing Plaintiff with the above-referenced telephone calls.

40. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, “hounding the plaintiff,” and, “a substantial burden to her existence,” thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

41. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

42. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.

43. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

COUNT IV

VIOLATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES AND CONSUMER PROTECTION LAW, 73 P.S. § 201-1, et seq.

44. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

45. The Defendants' violations of the Pennsylvania Fair Credit Extension Uniformity Act constitute per se violations under the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law.

46. The Defendants' acts were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law.

47. As a result of the Defendants' violations, the Plaintiff has suffered ascertainable losses entitling the Plaintiff to actual, statutory and treble damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;

3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) and 73 P.S. § 2270.5 against the Defendants;
4. Statutory damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 2270.5(c);
5. Actual damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
6. Statutory damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
7. Treble damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
8. Actual damages from the Defendants for all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
9. Punitive damages; and
10. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: May 30, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Jody B. Burton

Jody B. Burton, Esq.
Bar No.: 71681
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
Attorneys for Plaintiff